

ACTIVE CASES
Analysis November 2003 QA Results for Food Stamps

Sample Size: 82
(drops excluded)

Totals for November 2003:

LOCATION	TOTAL SAMPLE ISSUANCE	# of ERROR CASES	ERROR DOLLAR TOTAL	PERCENT DOLLARS IN ERROR	FFY 2004 ERROR RATE
STATEWIDE	14,244.00	10	795.00	5.58%	6.8%
MILWAUKEE	7,075.00	8	577.00	8.16%	10.3%
BAL- STATE	7,169.00	2	218.00	3.04%	4.1%

REDUCED REPORTING : (Phase 1)

No cases in this sample were considered errors under the old rules that would have been correct under reduced reporting.

ERROR CAUSES BY TYPE:

- 6- Agency Preventable Errors.
- 3- Client "failure to report" errors, all at certification or re-certification
- 1- CARES "error"- failed to exclude IPV person

OVERVIEW OF THE ERRORS AND WHERE THEY OCCURRED:

- Of the 6 APES, five were in Milwaukee, and one in balance of state.

TYPES OF APE ERRORS (6 total)

- 1- Failure to verify shelter and utilities at a move of residence
- 1- Failure to act on multiple Data Exchanges on RSDI for over a year
- 1- Failure to run SFED after making case changes
- 1-Sanctioned an FSET-exempt person
- 1- Failed to issue FS for the full benefit month (prorated in error)
- 1- Failure to budget earned income correctly

TYPES OF CLIENT NON-REPORTING ERRORS:

- 1- Failure to report correct rent at application (received rent assistance)
- 1- Failure to report rent increase at re-certification interview
- 1- Failure to report receipt of Social Security at application

TYPES OF CARES ERRORS (1):

- 1- CARES failed to exclude person for out-of-state IPV

TRENDS OR RECOMMENDATIONS?

- The month's error rate is definitely reduced statewide. Milwaukee is above what would be anticipated.
- We are seeing more of the benefits of the Reduced Reporting rules in effect.
- Most APE's this month were caused by actions taken or not taken between certifications. This is counter to a past record of most errors being made at certification or re-certification. However, with the past history and the importance of correct case set-up at cert and re-cert, as we move to 12-month FS certification periods, this should still be our emphasis. All the client errors were made at reviews or applications, and this suggests that some enhanced ESS skills in asking questions could be helpful. For example instead of asking, "Is your rent still the same," the worker asks "What is the amount you pay each month for rent?"
- Three agencies shared the 10 total errors this month.

"BIGGEST CONTRIBUTORS": The cases that caused the largest dollar errors for November 2003 (including client errors):

- **Green County, \$132 Agency Preventable Error:** At application the agency under-budgeted earned income by excluding vacation pay. History shows that the customer always is scheduled for 56 hours of work biweekly. For the estimate the ES excluded two weeks (56) of vacation pay. Had the person not been on vacation the person would have worked and made regular pay for that same period.
- **Milwaukee County, \$123 Agency Preventable Error:** Agency worker did not act timely or correctly on an October 15th application. The case was pended for income verification but no verification checklist was issued to the customer, with due dates. On November 19 the worker entered the income

information requested and opened FS as of that date. The worker should have issued FS from the original application since no notice of what was needed, or the due date was given. The full November benefit would have been issued.

- **Milwaukee County, \$121 Agency Preventable Error:** Agency failed to act on multiple data exchanges showing customer was receiving SSDI, although none had been budgeted. While there were various transfers of the case between workers (meaning newest worker doesn't get alerts that were sent to a previous worker), each worker had the case several months without acting on any of the alerts they did get in their name. Also, while the client has some culpability in not reporting, the Federal QC Manual (310) page B-24 states: *"Where both the agency and the client are responsible for the same error in an element the agency error takes precedence on the basis that the client's failure would have been negated, and no discrepancy would have existed had the agency acted properly."*